

127

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD.

Vol. XXI.

FEBRUARY, 1870.

No. 2.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

THE vital relation of this question to our personal and social interests and our national life, makes it to-day the foremost living issue before the people of the land. That it is so apprehended is evident from the fact that not only the pulpit, but the entire press, secular as well as religious, is engaged in its discussion. In meeting most wisely our responsibility in this matter, we propose to set forth the stronger points on either side, as stated by prominent writers who have most effectively presented these points. After a careful examination of the principal matter, printed in various forms, chiefly that which is most recent, we have selected, and in some sort arranged, the views of the several parties in the controversy. In asking of Christian men and American citizens a thoughtful perusal of this resumé of the discussion, we are bold to affirm that so full, thorough, and compact an exhibition of the subject can be found no where else.*

I. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW.

This is stated in few and very strong words. Concerning it there is a perfect agreement of Priesthood and Press in this country, Great Britain and the Romish world over.

Archbishop McCloskey comprehensively expresses the sentiment of his class in this moderate sentence :

"I can answer that, so far as our Catholic children are concerned, the workings of the public school system have proved, and do prove, *highly detrimental to their faith and morals.*"

* In selecting and condensing the matter given in these pages, it is believed that the meaning of a writer has in no case been enfeebled or altered by omission or otherwise. In a single instance, a paragraph has been transposed, and two words (in brackets) comprise the extent of our addition to the entire text of the writers quoted.

“A Catholic Priest,” in the *Boston Advertiser* says :

“Catholics would not be satisfied with the public schools even if the Protestant Bible and every vestige of religious teaching were banished from them. . . . They will not be taxed either for educating the children of Protestants, or for having their own children educated in schools under Protestant control.”

With greater detail, and in a more positive, caustic, and defiant style, the Press proclaims the same sentiment. The following are average specimens :

“The education itself is the business of the spiritual society alone, and not of secular society. The instruction of children and youth is included in the sacrament of orders, and the State usurps the functions of the spiritual society when it turns educator. The secular is for the spiritual, is subordinated to religion, which alone has authority to instruct man in his secular duties, and fit him for the end for which his Creator has created him. The organization of the schools, their entire internal arrangement and management, the choice and regulation of studies, and the selection, appointment, and dismissal of teachers, belong exclusively to the spiritual authority.”—*The Tablet*.

Excerpts from the Freeman's Journal.

“If the Catholic translation of the books of Holy Writ, which is to be found in the homes of all our better educated Catholics, were to be dissected by the ablest Catholic theologians in the land, and merely *lessons* to be taken from it—such as Catholic mothers read to their children ; and with all the notes and comments, in the popular edition, and others added, with the highest Catholic endorsement—and if these admirable Bible lessons, and these alone, were to be *ruled* as to be read in all the public schools, this would not diminish, in any substantial degree, the objection we Catholics have to letting Catholic children attend the public schools.”

“The *horrible immoralities* of the youth in the public schools and the disregard of religion among those brought up under their influences, prove our position, that the future of the Catholic Religion in this land is bound up with the exclusion of every schooling not under Catholic direction and control.”

“The Catholic solution of this muddle about Bible or no Bible in schools is, ‘hands off!’ No State taxation or donations for any schools. You look to your children, and we will look to ours. We don’t want you to be taxed for Catholic schools. We do not want to be taxed for Protestant, or for godless schools. *Let the Public School system go to where it came from—the devil.* We want Christian schools, and the State cannot tell us what Christianity is.”

“What we, Roman Catholics, must do now, is to get our own children out of *this devouring fire*. At any cost, and any sacrifice, we must deliver the children over whom we have control, *from these pits of destruction*, which lie invitingly in their way, under the name of *public* or district schools, &c.”

“Whereas : It is no more the duty of the State to provide for the schooling, than for the clothing and feeding and housing of children : And, Whereas : Twenty-five years of experiment of schools supported by public tax—but to the *exclusion of all positive religion*, has lamentably proved that teaching to read, write, cast up accounts, and have an idea of the topography of other countries—without the daily inculcation of the principles of Christian morals, as built on the dogmatic teachings of Revealed Religion—only make more expert knaves, and more dangerous neighbors : Therefore, Resolved : That the Public or Common School System, in New-York city, is a

windle on the people, an outrage on justice, a foul disgrace in matter of morals, and hat it imports for the State Legislature to abolish it forthwith."

"This subject [of the public schools] contains in it the whole question of the progress and triumphs of the Catholic Church in the next generation in this country. Catholics! let us all act together! Let us all read and listen to the same sentiments, that we may know how to act together!"

Again, "There can be no sound political progress—no permanence in the State, where for any length of time children shall be trained in schools without (the Roman Catholic) religion."

Again, "This country has no other hope, politically or morally, except in the vast and controlling extension of the Catholic religion."

Let us cite from a Roman Catholic layman, writing to the *N.Y. Tribune*:

"We don't want to mix up with Protestants, and Jews, and Infidels in school matters, because we want our children to grow up in the Holy Roman Faith, like their fathers, and not imbibe the loose and irreligious independence of the age. We don't want our children to attend irreligious schools, nor schools where they shall be mixed up with other children; we want to send them to Catholic schools, under Catholic teachers, and we want our proportion of the school money according to the number of our scholars, and we enter on the controversy with this sole aim and purpose: and we don't want any false issues made about it."

To this view of the entire Roman Catholic Body, we append the reply of the *Tribune* to the layman, as expressing the universal judgment of the pulpit and press outside the pale or the influence of the Romish Church:

"With an anxious desire to make any reasonable and proper concession, it seems to us that compliance with the Roman Catholic demand, as above presented, is simply impossible, because incompatible with the preservation of the Common School system in its essence. For we cannot concede to Catholics what we refuse to others; and Jews, Infidels, Rationalists, and every other denomination, may claim separate schools, and we shall have to concede them; thus breaking up our schools entirely. We must take our stand and fight for Common Schools, or consent to see a very large portion of our children grow up illiterate and unfit for some of the most important duties of republican citizenship. Any sect or class is at perfect liberty to educate its own children in separate schools. No one objects to that. But Common School education is a very different matter; and that we must insist on providing for all at the public expense."

II. THE VIEWS AND REASONINGS OF THOSE (PROTESTANTS) WHO CONSENT THAT THE BIBLE BE EXCLUDED FROM OUR SCHOOLS.

Their leading positions (as stated by Dr. Clark, of Albany) are

"First—that the State has nothing to do with religious education; that its only and proper sphere is to give a secular education to qualify its citizens for the ordinary duties of life.

Secondly—That the Bible, or at least the Protestant version of it, is a sectarian book, and that the reading of it in the public schools infringes upon the rights of the Roman Catholics who contribute, through the taxes they pay, to the support of these schools.

Thirdly—That our Government is based upon the principle of universal freedom,

and that by insisting upon having the Bible read in our schools we violate the consciences of the Roman Catholic population, who are, with all others, entitled to the benefits of this freedom."

To these we add,

Fourthly—That the reading of the Bible, as now practised in the Schools, is a mere perfunctory service, of too little effect and value to justify its maintenance in the face of the existing peril to the School system.

We cite first from an article by the Rev. Dr. Spear, in the *Independent*.

The *argument* of the Catholic, and of those who adopt his conclusion, may be briefly stated in the following propositions: 1. That our common schools are managed by the government, and supported by public funds, which are collected by a general tax levied indiscriminately upon all taxpayers—whether they be Catholics, Protestants, Free Thinkers, Deists, or Atheists. 2. That the *prime* object of these schools is to furnish to the masses an opportunity for acquiring the rudimental elements of a common education, such as will fit children to become useful and thrifty citizens, and not to inculcate any of the special doctrines of the Christian religion, or favor any of the peculiar tenets of religious sects. 3. That, in the constitution of this government, both state and national, *all* the people considered as citizens occupy the same ground and are entitled to precisely the same rights; and that too without any reference to their religious creeds. This makes a complete severance of all organic connection between religion and the state, and leaves the citizen free, without any pains, penalties, or disabilities, to exercise his rights of conscience according to his best judgment, with the single qualification that he must not so exercise them as to interfere with the rights of others. 4. That the reading of King James's version of the Scriptures in our public schools is practically a Protestant method of religious teaching, which, however agreeable to the great mass of Protestants, is offensive to the conscientious scruples of Catholics, and perhaps some others, who, although they are taxed to support these schools, decline for this reason to send their children there, and substitute therefor private schools under their own special management.

The premises are undoubtedly the very ones upon which Protestants would strenuously insist for a like conclusion, provided a Douay version were the one whose reading was the matter in debate. They would object to the use of the *Catholic* Bible in schools conducted by the state and supported by funds for whose creation they were taxed. In our judgment, the objection would be well taken; and hence we are not able to see why, upon the essential merits of the argument, the objection is not just as well taken when urged by Catholics against a like use of the *Protestant* Bible. Protestants have no more right to force the reading of King James's version of the Scriptures upon the children of Catholics than Catholics would have to force the Douay version upon the children of Protestants. Both are alike taxed for the support of public schools, and both live under a government which disowns all formal connection between church and state.

It necessarily results, from this view of the case, that the controversy between the Protestant and the Catholic can never be harmoniously settled, except by their mutual agreement to *omit* the reading of *any* version of the Scriptures in our public schools. They must come to this point, or continue the warfare, deciding the question in this locality, and that according to the accidental preponderance of numbers. If this be all that the Catholics desire, then we can see no sufficient reason why Protestants should not meet them on this basis. It is a fair basis, just to all parties. With it the Catholic ought to be satisfied; and surely the Protestant can afford to

make the concession (if such it be), when he remembers that if the Douay version were the one in debate, he would demand a like concession to his views.

If, however, the Catholic programme be agitation, either for the purpose of breaking up the common school system or for that of diverting a portion of the public funds to the support of private Catholic schools, as a sort of peace-offering, then we pronounce the programme utterly insincere in its argument and just as objectionable in its end. To neither of these purposes would we yield for a moment. The common school system ought to be maintained "at all hazards," and against all enemies. No sectarian affinities in any direction ought ever to jeopard its interests. Moreover, not a dollar of the public money ought ever to be appropriated for the support of any sectarian schools, whether they be Catholic or Protestant. It is a breach of faith. It is virtually *stealing* the public money, and applying it to purposes entirely foreign to those for which it was collected.

There is no peril to the cause of religion in this land, and none to the Bible, to arise from the adoption of the view we propose. The truth is, it is not religion or the Bible that is really in peril, so much as it is the common school system itself. There are other agencies, partly in the family and partly in the church, for disseminating religion among men, which all are at perfect liberty to use, and all will use according to the type of their elective affinities. These agencies, entirely voluntary in their character and absolutely unrestricted in their scope, and not the common school, are the great instruments in forming and fixing the religious sentiments of the people. They operate, as they should, independently of all state control or state patronage. It ought to be sufficient alike for Catholics and Protestants to employ these agencies, without confronting each other as religious antagonists in respect to the common school. Neither should ask of the other what neither can conscientiously grant. Both should consent here to be *citizens*, without bringing their religious antipathies into the domain of their citizenship. This will involve no sacrifice of principle and no jeopardy to religion, while it will most effectually promote the greatest good of the greatest number. Protestants will lose nothing by it, and Catholics lose nothing to which they are justly entitled.

In an elaborate paper on State Theology (*Independent*, Dec. 30), Dr. Spear opposes a distinctive theological teaching by the State. As yet, we have no advocate for dogmatic instruction from the Bible in the schools. The utmost that is asked, is that the word of God be allowed to make its own inculcations and impressions, without human interpretation or formulation of its statements into dogma. If his argument has any application to this controversy, it bears only against the Romish priesthood, who avowedly aim to teach a system of doctrine that will establish Rome's supremacy over the State.

We add, in this connection, that the *Independent's* own argument (of same date) scarcely touches the question at issue. In a comparison between the denominational and the common school, it conclusively establishes the superiority of the State system. But it ignores the obligation of the State to *introduce any moral element into its schedule of instruction*, which is the question under discussion.

The *Nation* (N.Y.) puts the matter thus succinctly :

What is the duty of the State with regard to education, if it have any duty at all? Is it not to take facts as it finds them, and get the children of the community

educated—if not in the way the majority think best, in the only way possible? Catholics, with their feelings about the Bible and about state schools, are *facts*, and have to be dealt with as facts. If it be true that a Catholic boy who is taught to read and write is less likely to commit crimes, and more likely to prove a good citizen, than if he did not know how to read or write, and he refuses to be taught, if we insist on reading the Scriptures to him every morning, is it not our duty to teach him to read and write at any rate, and to give up reading the Scriptures to him?

Then comes the other question, and perhaps the more important one—suppose we succeed in reading the Bible in the schools, are we sufficiently sure of the good effects of our reading even on Protestant children to warrant us in keeping the Catholics in a constant state of irritation, and furnishing them with a constant incentive to intrigue and agitate for the overthrow of our whole educational system, and for the appropriation of large sums of the public money for the sole and separate use of their own sectarian schools—a consummation they have nearly reached in this State? Is it well ascertained that the official reading of the Bible in school-hours, and as part of the school exercises, and as the forerunner of an irksome and weary day, is a good mode either of increasing children's reverence for it or fixing its teachings in their memory? Is not the experience of every country dead against the mixing up of secular and religious instruction, as tending to make the latter mischievous without improving the former? Do any countries turn out such an amount of atheism and materialism as those in which the religious instruction of children plays the largest part in their school life, and is most completely taken out of the hands of their parents—we mean the Catholic countries of Europe? Is there, in the matter of religious teaching, any possible substitute for the home, the church, and the Sunday-school; and does anybody know of boy or girl who ever acquired a religious impression of the least value or permanence anywhere else?

We believe there is only one answer to be made to these questions, and if there be but one, and the Bible-reading in the schools be a real cause of offence to Catholics, Jews, or even infidels, and be calculated to drive them away from the schools, toward the expenses of which they contribute, or to endanger the school system, the part of wisdom and the part of Christian charity, let us say, would seem to be to give it up without fighting over it.

With these views, substantially agree the *N. Y. Times* and *Evening Post*, and, perhaps, the majority of leading secular journals in this City and State. The minority, however, is large, and of a highly influential character.

More squarely and sharply writes *Mr. Beecher* :

Now, for ourselves, we believe that the Bible in schools would do a world of good and no harm. We wish that everybody thought as we do. When all the inhabitants of a district are agreed in having a Bible, they should have the liberty of making it a text-book in schools. But, when the parents are of mixed faiths, and when many of them do not believe the Bible to be the word of God, it is not right to compel their children to read it, or hear it read? This is religious compulsion, cover it as you may. It is taxing men for the propagation of opinions which they repudiate. A compulsory Bible in schools is not in accordance with American doctrines of liberty of conscience.

It is not necessary, then, for the State to teach the Bible for any reason of its own existence or safety. But it is necessary on the ground of both political safety, and of moral integrity, to secure intelligence. However great the benefit of churches to

the community, and we are not likely to underrate them, they are not so related to the existence of the State as to make it necessary for the State to secure its own healthful existence by maintaining them.

But it is absolutely necessary that a government which exists by the consent of all its citizens should secure in those citizens the ability to consider its actions, and to form intellectual judgments upon them. Education is a political necessity. It is a fundamental civil duty. If the State has not a right to establish free schools, then it has no right to lay the indispensable foundations of its own permanence. Republican governments must have an intelligent common people. Free schools are the factors of intelligence. They must be maintained. Sectarianism must not be allowed to pervert them. If the Bible is the entering wedge of sectarianism to the common schools, then, much as we prize it, the Bible must be taken out of the common schools.—*Christian Union*.

We quote, further, on the same side, the reasoning of the *Advance* upon a single, but *vital* point in the discussion :

Another objection confounds religion with morals, and argues that if we omit the reading of the Bible in the schools, out of regard to the scruples of parents, we shall soon be called upon to omit all moral instruction, because some set of enthusiasts will arise opposed to morality. Our reply is, that the community is agreed on fundamental morals, but is hopelessly at variance on theological points ; and, further and more deeply, that morality is directly involved in the nature of society, in the very basis of the State itself, and in all constitutions and laws ; so that no objection could lie against teaching morals in school, which would not be also against the school, against the whole legislation of the country, against all civil government, and against civilization itself ; as all these depend upon the recognition and enforcement of the distinction between right and wrong embodied in morality. The religious differences of men sustain no such direct relation to the schools, nor to organized society. Morality belongs alike to church and State, and may be taught and enforced accordingly ; while religion is the special charge of the church alone, and receives but incidental recognition from the State.

“ But,” the objector might rejoin, “ *What system of morals*, Pagan or Christian ? If Christian, that of the corrupt churches, or the Reformed ? And, if of the Reformed, where is it to be found save in the Word of God, how is it to be made known but through the simple reading of the word ?”

Only three or four other religious journals have expressed, in more general terms, a willingness to omit the reading of the Bible. Of this class, we cite from each of the two leading Methodist journals of New York city, brief paragraphs, almost identical in expression :

In the week day common school we would have our youth taught well, and exclusively, those departments of letters and arts which shall fit them for secular life. We wish admitted there no religious forms, even, except such as may be befitting introductory ceremonies, and, at the same time, perfectly unobnoxious to any reasonable objection from even the most tenacious Papist. The reading of certain portions of the Bible, and the utterance of a brief, unsectarian, opening prayer, should certainly be inoffensive ; but we might omit even these, rather than have the common-school system broken to pieces.—*Christian Advocate*.

The introductory ceremony of the Lord's Prayer, or of any brief unsectarian prayer, and the reading of such a portion of the Bible as all candid men can approve, should suffice for the religious part of the common-school system. And evidently any thing else of the kind must be impracticable amidst our complicated sectarianism.

We would rather omit these than endanger the system by farther intrusions of religious forms or lessons which might be obnoxious to honest religious prejudice, and thereby keep away the children of any religious party.—*Methodist*.

It should be added, that all other prominent journals of this denomination strongly oppose any concession.

III. VIEWS AND REASONINGS OF THOSE WHO JUSTIFY, AND SO INSIST UPON, THE READING OF THE BIBLE IN THE SCHOOLS.

Our citations here are of necessity more extended. A specific arrangement of the whole matter under its several points did not seem so practicable or useful as the printing by itself the entire selection from each writer.

As an appropriate transition from the *second* head, and for the argumentative force of its asserted facts, we quote first from Mr. Greeley :

So far as it was left to our choice, we should wish to continue the use of the Bible in Schools.

Yet our interest in common schools would lead us to concede much for the sake of conciliating those who might cherish views widely different from ours. As the true mother to whom Solomon righteously awarded the contested child, preferred to give it up rather than have it divided, we would rather give up the reading of the Bible in Schools than give up the schools altogether.

But here is our discouragement and perplexity : *The great body of those who seek to drive the Bible out of our schools, will not be satisfied after they have driven it out, but will insist on breaking up our common school system into sectarian fragments. They are determined that their children shall be schooled in the tenets of their especial theology and ecclesiasticism, not in their own Churches and Sunday-schools, on that day of the week which is by law and usage devoted to religious uses, but on other days, as a part of their schooling in letters. They will not allow secular and religious education to be given separately ; they refuse to unite in upholding the sanctity of Sunday ; they object to such general religious instruction as has hitherto been given in our schools, and object to education without religion as godless,—in short, they will be satisfied with nothing but the substitution of denominational for common schools. Hence, if we give up the Bible, we only weaken the common school system by offending, if not alienating, many of its oldest and firmest supporters, while we fail to conciliate its enemies, but only incite them to new and inadmissible exactions.*

That our apprehensions on this point are abundantly justified, we prove by showing how this controversy is waged where the Bible is *not* read in the Common Schools. Mr. W. H. Hurlbut, widely known as an intelligent journalist, whose politics are the antipodes of ours, and who in religion is at all events no biggot, being on his way through eastern Europe to the Suez celebration, writes from Hungary to *The World*, under the date of Pesth, Oct. 20, as follows :—"The Austro-Hungarian government as you know, last year adopted a system for the secularization of the schools. This greatly needed reform has been violently opposed by the Catholic

clergy. It has just been carried into effect in Ofen. Now, in Ofen are many Jews, and these Jews are disorderly and indecent enough to have a great many children. The Jewish children being sent, under the new system, to the public school, the Catholic pastor of Ofen last Sunday got up in his pulpit and called upon his flock not to suffer their offspring to be contaminated by contact in the school with a horde of Jewish brats—'Juden-baden,' as his reverence was kind enough to call the same. The good man's seed fell upon fertile soil. On Monday, a great mob, mostly composed of what St. Charles Borromeo called the 'devout female sex,' marched upon the school-house, stormed it, walloped the teachers, and drove forth the 'Jewish brats' howling into the streets. It is a pleasing peculiarity of human nature always to hunt whatever is hunted. So from all the highways and byways of Ofen the lieges sallied out and joined in the *chasse aux Juifs*. The parents of the sorely-belabored 'brats,' being as savage as the sea-wolves, of whom the companions of Vasco de Gama relate that 'they are horribly ferocious animals, and *when they are attacked defend themselves*,' came to the rescue of their little ones, and a general fight ensued. The Jews got the worst of it, and things went so far, that the authorities had to send for the 'Honveds,' or national guards, before order could be fully restored. On Wednesday, the Prince-Primate of Hungary, the Archbishop of Gran, came out and praised the Ofen priest for his zeal in the assertion of the principles of true religion!"

The first extended citations we take from a Report of Mr. A. E. Rankin to the Vermont Board of Education (Sept. 1868.) We especially commend them as worthy of thorough consideration.

I suppose it to be a recognized fact, that the State took into its own hands the management of the educational interests of its children, because it felt that its own permanence and security depended upon the intelligence and virtue of its citizens. The whole end of education, so far as the State is concerned, is to make good citizens. Will this end be best secured by giving some prominence in our system of public instruction to the development and culture of the moral element of human nature, or by entirely ignoring and studiously avoiding every exercise which shall aid in a proper moral culture? No Republican government can long stand, if a strong and vigorous moral sentiment be not inculcated into the minds of its people, and the public conscience be not educated and enlightened. To leave the moral faculty uninstructed is to leave out of education its most essential element.

The history of the world shows that men devoid of moral principle can only be governed by force. And if we suffer this moral element in the education of the children of the State to be sacrificed to a falsely so-called spirit of liberality, which after all is but a specious phase of bigotry, the time is not so far distant but that some now living may see it, when our government shall be as changeable and transitory as that of Mexico or the sister republics of Central America; or we shall see the country dotted with barracks, as it now is with school-houses.

The nations of the old world have borrowed the common school from us, but several of them have surpassed us in developing the resources of the system. They repel with indignation the idea that moral instruction is not proper for the school, and spurn with contempt the objection that the Bible cannot be introduced into the public school without encouraging a sectarian bias.

The question how far the religious teaching of the Bible can be carried, consistently with the general principles of free government, presents some difficulties. I make no advocacy for denominational instruction. I would exclude that entirely. But the idea of educating a moral being, while wholly ignoring and excluding moral influences, is preposterous.

As a work of *literature*, the Bible has no equal. Webster, Carlyle, Coleridge, Chalmers, each expresses the opinion that the inspired book of Job is the sublimest poem in the possession of mankind. The historical portions of the Bible are unsurpassed in ancient or modern literature.

No imagination has ever conceived stories which equal in beauty and pathos, the stories of the Old Testament. They are always fresh and new. They fascinate the young. They interest the old. It is the only book ever written in which the characters are not overdrawn and distorted. The human race could better spare all other books than be deprived of the Bible.

Daniel Webster said : "I have read through the entire Bible many times. I now make a practice to go through it once a year. It is the book of all others for lawyers, as well as divines, and I pity the man who cannot find in it a rich supply of thought and of rules for his conduct. It fits a man for life. It prepares him for death."

Its merits, as the best book as a model in all classes of literature, alone, claims for it a prominent place among the list of text-books to be used in every school.

But as a text-book in morals, the Bible is incomparable. It is universally conceded to be the book best adapted to interest and unfold the moral faculties, that can be put into the hands of the child. No work of man can ever rival it. This is alike conceded by all intelligent men of all Christian denominations.

All past history establishes the fact that no people, however cultivated, however blessed with intelligence, that have lacked that moral element which can *best be inculcated through a judicious and proper inculcation of moral principles in the daily life of the public school*, have been able long to sustain a system of self-government.

With what propriety, I ask, can the inculcation of the broad principles of the Christian religion be said to be a sectarian or denominational work?

The Prussians have a maxim that whatever you would have appear in a nation's life, you must put into the public schools.

The manner in which life is begun, usually determines its future course. It was a remark of the Roman satirist, Juvenal, that "the greatest reverence is due to children." They are close and accurate observers in their early days, before they come to have ideas and thoughts of their own, to divide their attention. Better then, than ever after, can the principles of the Bible be indelibly impressed upon the mind.

It is urged that King James' edition of the Bible is sectarian in its teaching—that it is a "Protestant Bible." This very version is the translation of Catholics. Tyndale, Wickliffe, Coverdale and Mathew were all Roman Catholics. A Roman Catholic king permitted it to be printed and circulated. A Roman Catholic bishop drafted the license to read it, until a better translation could be provided, which he hoped would not be till doomsday. Of it, says Bishop Leddes, himself a Catholic, and a translator of the Scriptures, "It is of all versions the most excellent for accuracy, fidelity, and the strictest letter of the text." Says Selden, "It is the best version in the world."

The fact that Roman Catholics are unwilling their own version—the Douay Bible—the only sectarian Bible—should be in the hands of the people, shows conclusively that this is no question of version; but that the book itself is obnoxious. Papacy has always claimed that it was "not a book to be in the hands of the people." The Bishop of Bologna, in an advisory letter to Paul III., whose Papal reign was during the period of the most energetic progress of the Reformation, alluding to the Catholic Church, says: "She is persuaded that this is the book which above all others, raises such storms and tempests. And that truly, if any one read it and observe her (the Church of Rome) own customs and practices, he will see that there is no agree-

ment between them, and that the doctrine which she preaches, is altogether different, and sometimes contrary to that contained in the Bible." Because, forsooth, a certain word, which is of infrequent occurrence, and which Papists would render "do penance," is translated "repent"—and this is the material difference in the versions,—the children of the State, of whom there are many, to whom if the Bible is closed in school, it is open to them nowhere, must be deprived the privilege of its use. No greater wrong can be done to the Catholic himself than to exclude the Bible from the schools. No book can supply its place. Says a Roman Catholic, "Who will not say that the uncommon beauty and marvelous English of the Protestant Bible is one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country! It lives on the ear like the music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things, rather than words. It is a part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. The memory of the dead passes with it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments, and all that there has been about him of soft and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him forever out of his English Bible. It is his sacred thing, which doubt has never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. In the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible."

It is urged by those who oppose the use of this Bible in school, that its use conflicts with certain individual rights, guaranteed by the State constitution. This objection is worthy of consideration.

That system of education which regards only the cultivation of the mind will fall far short of educating the child. In an English court, it was decided in 1842, that the courts of England "will not sanction any system of education in which religion is not included." In course of the hearing, the court remarked that "a scheme of education without religion would be worse than mockery."

The constitution of the United States, which contains a clause similar to that found in all our State constitutions, recognizing the rights of conscience, in another clause provides as follows: "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to a good government, and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." The framers of that constitution did not recognize a system of education in which religious as well as moral instruction was not included.

The framers of State constitutions had no design to exclude moral and religious instruction from the public school. Says Chief Justice Shaw: "The public school system was intended to provide a 'system of moral training.'" Says a writer on the subject of constitutional interpretation: "Security and morality are the supreme law of every land, whether they be expressly acknowledged or not." All morality is based upon religion, and the only religion recognized in this country is the religion of the Bible.

Let us now examine the rights of the individual in their relations to the rights of the State.

The courts have repeatedly held that if the State, in exercising a necessary power for the good of the public, make a requirement, without the direct effect of persecuting, punishing, restraining or hurting any one for his religious opinions, though his religious belief indirectly is the occasion of his being abridged in his civil rights of conscience, it does not infringe upon the rights of conscience as they are recognized in our constitution.

Now the reading of the Bible is not a direct compelling of attendance upon religious worship. Religious worship is but an incident to the school. Whatever

would be suffered by expulsion would be indirect and incidental, which, although it might have been occasioned by religious opinions, was not the direct effect of the requirements, nor any part of its object.

It is a novel kind of Republicanism in which the rights of the individual are recognized as paramount to the rights of the many. I have been taught that as a compensation for the protection which society affords to the individual, he, on entering it, is called upon to give up certain personal rights, whenever they conflict with the rights of the community. This is the doctrine of the text-books. Is it urged that schools are public and all tax-payers have a vested right in them? Chief Justice Shaw has held that this is not an absolute but a common right, and to be enjoyed as public common rights must be enjoyed, subject to restrictions and conditions made for the good of all. Says the Supreme Court of Maine: "*salus populi suprema lex*" is a maxim of universal application, and when liberty of conscience would interfere with the paramount rights of the public it ought to be restrained. Even Mr. Jefferson, than whom a more resolute champion of liberty never lived, claimed no indulgence for anything that is detrimental to society, though it springs from a religious belief, or no belief at all. His position is that civil government is instituted only for temporal objects, and that spiritual matters are legitimate subjects of civil cognizance no farther than they may stand in the way of these objects. As far as the interests of society are involved, its right to interfere on the principle of self-preservation is not disputed." Says the same Court, in a decision involving the question of the use of the Bible in the public schools, if its use conflicts with the constitution, much more so do those laws requiring the observance of the Sabbath.

Our constitutions provide securities, confer and limit powers and recognize rights. These rights in practical operation sometimes conflict, each with the other. "In such cases," says a learned jurist, "some adjustments and compromises must be made. Several such have been established by judicial decisions, the necessity of which will be acquiesced in by all reasonable men." As an instance: the Atheist, or he who disbelieves in a future existence of rewards and punishments, is abridged in his civil rights, in that he is denied the exercise of a privilege which is granted to all others except felons,—that of testifying in a court of justice. The first day of the week is set apart by law for rest and worship. But the Jew, believing the seventh to be the true Sabbath, is compelled by his conscience to observe that, while the State exacts the observance of the first; whereby he loses one day in seven, which is granted to his more fortunate neighbor. Quakers are ineligible to judicial office because their consciences will not allow them to administer oaths. They are also required to bear arms, and on their refusal so to do are subject to penalties. "Has a Brahmin or any other religionist a constitutional right to a separate hospital, or jail, or alms-house, because he scruples at eating what has once been endowed with animal life?" These laws and others of a like nature have been held not to conflict with those provisions in our constitutions, which recognize and protect the rights of conscience. The right of society and the right of the individual come in conflict, and the former is deemed paramount.

It is not difficult to adjust the question of individual rights if we but remember that no man can exercise what he may be pleased to term a right of conscience, whenever such exercise shall endanger the prosperity of the State. I do not unadvisedly put this interpretation upon what is termed the rights of conscience. The courts have held it to be correct. And who will deny that the prosperity of the State depends upon the use of the Bible in our schools? This position is sustained by the testimony of Mr. Webster, Mr. Everett, Dr. Sears, and a host of other worthies.

The constitution of the United States, in a clause already quoted, provides as fol-

ows : "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to a good government, and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." What religion is meant? Christianity; for Christianity is the law of the land. Says Blackstone : "Christianity is a part of the law of England," and in a note to an American edition of his commentaries, we find that "we have received the Christian religion as a part of the common law." The courts of New York have held that Christianity is a part of the common law. Says Mr. Webster, in his argument in the Girard will case : "Christianity is the law of the land." The constitution then requires that the Christian religion shall be taught in our schools. But the Christian religion is based upon the Bible. How then shall it be taught in our schools if the Bible be excluded?

Says Mr. Webster : "Statutes against blasphemy and violation of the Sabbath and others of the same effect, proceed on this great broad principle, that the preservation of Christianity is one of the great and leading ends of government." It is the prevailing opinion that the government has only to do with secular affairs. But such doctrine is subversive of republicanism, which is defined "a system of government designed to secure the greatest good to the greatest number." "A republican government must have some religion, for its end is the conservation of freedom to the people, which cannot be secured without the aid of the great truths of Christianity. It must use religion and appeals to conscience and future retribution, or it cannot attain its end in the conservation of freedom to the people. It is not to do it for religion's sake simply, but it may and must employ religion for freedom's sake." "All regard for honest difference of conscience should be exhibited as far as may be, and yet with a single eye to public liberty." I quote from the highest authority in political ethics which our country affords. "Individual choice in religion may be as subversive of public freedom as individual choice in anything else. The very end of civil government is to restrain individual choice. If then any man's religion leads him to outrage public sentiment, it is not to be tolerated because he pleads conscience and religion for it. The State must take its stand upon its religion, upon its own responsibility, and then carry out its government in subordinating individual choices, religious or otherwise."

"If, at any time or any place, individual choice militates against public freedom in its progress to the highest civilization, it is a reason for State interference. In a Protestant nation, the Protestant Bible should be used in the public schools, and thus carry out the public choice according to the public conscience, in its system of popular education for freedom's sake, and in this, its authority is as legitimate as in any civil legislation. A thorough system of education must be secured, or the ignorance of the people will necessarily circumscribe their freedom. The State must see that this is effected, and if religious influence is necessary in such popular education, the State has the righteous authority so far to use it."

We make, next, two extracts from an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, (Vol. XIII. No. 52,) by Rev. J. H. Seelye. The first sets forth the principle on which the connection of the State with religion may be affirmed :

The State is not a mere aggregation of the individuals who represent it; just as the man is something more than the sum of the particles which compose his body. Neither do these individuals, together with the laws which connect them under one government, constitute the State, any more than do the particles of a man's body, in their union through dynamic agencies, make up the man. There is a spirituality which is the man; and it is this same spirituality, in a broader sense, which is the State. The State is the actual exhibition, it is the real carrying out and maintaining

of universal principles which the reason, the spirituality of every man announces. They are not accidental, they are not invented, they are not forced upon us, but they spring up necessarily with human nature itself, and without them human nature could not be conceived. They are like those Divine commands of which Sophocles says, in the *Antigone*, "they are not of yesterday, or to-day ; no : they live without end, and no one knows how they came or when they came." The State is, at the same time, the embodiment of these universal principles, as they come out in the institutions of any people ; and it represents, also, that true and substantial spirituality in man, from which these principles spring ; just as to Minerva, among the Athenians, belonged the twofold significance of bearing the name of the people as a whole, and being also the goddess who represented their inner character and spirit.

The State is thus essential to human society. It is not the result of any agreement or compact among individuals, as though it would not exist were the compact wanting. No one has any more right or power to say that he will not grow up under the sway of some State, than to say that he will not grow up into his own manhood. The State is as necessary to him as his own manhood, and he can therefore no more throw off the one than the other. "It is manifest," says Aristotle, "that the State is one of the things which exist by nature, and that man is, by nature, an animal living in States."

All this brings out the intimate and necessary connection of the State with religion : the two grow out of the same element in the human soul. It is the reason, the conscience, the will of man, which makes him a subject of God, and it is this which constitutes him a citizen [because a subject] of the State. It is this spirituality by which he can hold communion with his Maker ; and it is this, also, which gives him a real community with his kind. Public law, if it shall be established and defined, must spring from the same spirituality where religion itself has its seat. Religion, in order to its full exhibition, needs a social relation, among men and the State ; in order to its valid existence, needs a religious condition in man. The State cannot be conceived without religion ; for it is the essence of the State to be an arrangement and exposition of ethical principles ; and this would be inconceivable without a religious ground. The State and religion form, together, one ethical whole, which, though they may sometimes be spoken of as separate, are yet ever united in one germ, in one common and living root ; just as the soul, in the individual man, is one undivided whole, though we sometimes speak of its separate faculties, as understanding, susceptibility, and will. We can no more separate, in the present condition of man, religion and the State, and consider the one as independent of the other, than we can any two faculties of the human soul.

The second notices the objection from conscience to the use of the Bible in schools.

The objection may be summarily answered. The authority of the State may never be subordinated to the individual conscience. The State has its own end, of highest freedom ; government has its end, of securing to its subjects the enjoyment of this freedom. The State uses religion as a means to this end ; but religion itself is never an end with the State. Everything relating to the moral and religious life of its subjects, is of interest to the State only so far as the State can use it for its own ends. The State has nothing to do with the inner character, and cares nothing about this, so long as the outward action pleases it. To the individual, conscience is of more importance than the State ; but to the State, nothing is so important as its own supremacy. If the will of the State come in conflict with the will or the conscience of an individual, the individual may suffer martyrdom, but the State may

not waver. That the safety of the public is the supreme law, is a maxim of universal application, and liberty of conscience may never interfere with the public weal.

The real difficulty in this question lies in confounding two things radically different. The State is for time ; conscience, for eternity. The State knows nothing higher than itself ; conscience is responsible to God. With the State, religion is a means ; with conscience, it is an end. When, therefore, these two spheres come in hostile conflict, we need not ask which should yield to the other ; each must triumph on its own ground : the State, for this world ; conscience, for the next ; the State enforcing its own claims, and conscience adhering to the claims of God ; the State using conscience as a means, and conscience triumphing in it as an end.

Another point should here be noticed : any argument which affirms a connection of the State with religion, and the duty of the State to maintain its religion, is very apt to be met with the objection that this might sanction any extent of religious persecution. But the objection overlooks some of the principles we have advanced, and has no force against the others. Religion is not, in any proper sense, an end of the State. The State, though having its ground in the spiritual or religious element in humanity, has no aim beyond this present life. Its relations are altogether to mankind as an organized community ; and its peculiar and entire province is, to guide the working of this community according to the highest civilization and freedom. This is its true and highest end ; and while it may use everything else subordinately to this, it may use this for nothing. Religion may be employed by the State as a means to secure the end of civilization and freedom ; but these latter may never be yielded to subserve any religious advancement. With the individual, religion is primary and an end ; with the State, it is only secondary, and a means. To suppose that there could be any other true relation between the two, would make the State a nullity. Hence whenever the demands of civilization and of freedom are disregarded, and the State tramples on these interests for the sake of any religious considerations, it has gone beyond its true bounds, and altogether transcended its legitimate authority. We may say that the State in such a case is wrong, not because it has sought to maintain its religion, but because it has made this its *supreme end*, and reduced to an inferior importance what are really its highest objects of pursuit. The principles upon which we must determine the right and the wrong of a State's action, in any given instance, are not those Divine laws which are to control the spiritual life of the individual for eternity. There are temporal and earthly interests for the individual ; and it is to subserve these that there is a State, a community, among men. These interests are undoubtedly secured more perfectly through the agency of some religion ; and hence the proper and necessary connection of religion with the State. But in this connection, religion is ever the servant, never the sovereign. It is to be used to secure some end ; and may never be changed by the State so as to become, itself, the end to be secured. The highest question for the State to ask is, not what does religion demand, but what are the demands of civilization and freedom ? since these cover the individual's highest temporal and earthly interests. The wrong of persecution by the State, can be demonstrated on no other grounds. It is wrong because it makes religion an end, and interferes with the highest civilization and freedom, the only true end of the State.

From another part of the same article, we cite this brief paragraph :

Says M. Cousin, in his Report upon the Public Instruction in Germany : "The general system of instruction is grounded on the Bible as translated by Luther, the catechism, and Scripture history ; and every wise man will rejoice in this ; for, with three-fourths of the population, morality can be instilled only through the medium of religion. Luther's forcible and popular translation of the Bible is in circu-

lation, from one end of Protestant Germany to the other, and has greatly aided in the moral and religious education of the people." The distinguished philosopher also observes, that he regards it as a great calamity for France that they have not a translation of the Bible of equal merit, and of as wide a circulation.

Professor Tayler Lewis thus disposes of the "specious plea of neutrality," and the equally specious use of the word "secular," in application to this controversy :

Let us test this specious plea of neutrality. What does it imply? If carried strictly out to the exclusion of everything religious, or having a religious tendency, it must consistently demand a like exclusion of everything that in the least manifests the opposite tendency, under whatever specious disguises it may be veiled. It does not alter the case in the least, that opinions, regarded as irreligious, or as undermining, or in any way weakening the grounds of belief, take to themselves the specious names of Literature, or Politics, or Political Economy, or Phrenology, or the Philosophy of History. No such sham pass-words should give to Buckle and Combe admittance where Butler and Chalmers are shut out. Everything that makes it less easy for the child to believe his catechism, "taught at home," as they say, is a break of the supposed concordat. The mere objection is to be heeded. It is enough that things seem so to serious men, as capable of correct reasoning as any on the other side; or that it is the opinion, the prejudice, if any choose so to call it, of a devout ignorance. The thoughtful religious man might be willing to forego his objection, if there were or could be real impartiality. He might trust a true moral and religious training as fully able to counteract anything of an opposite tendency. But to let in the enemy, and then take away the weapon of defence—this is a neutrality hard to be understood.

Now there can be no doubt of the fact, that there is admitted into our schools, our colleges, our educational libraries, into the reading-rooms connected with them, much that is thus *deemed* irreligious in its tendency—at least, by the holders of our stricter creeds. There is much that is silently alienating the minds of their children from the doctrines held sacred by their fathers. We might go further: there is much that tends to undermine all religious belief, even of the freest cast. What young man can have his mind filled with the atheistical speculations of Mill and Spencer, or be exposed to the uncounteracted theories of Darwin and Huxley, and yet retain unimpaired his belief in a providence as taught by Christ, a providence that "numbers the very hairs of our heads," or listen as before to the prayer that ascends from the family altar? These writers profess a kind of theism, it is said; but wherein, as far as any moral power is concerned, does it differ from a belief in quadratic equations, or the dogmas of heat and magnetism?

The matter, as we have stated it, would be too plain for argument, were it not for those magical words, *secular* and *sectarian*, that some are so fond of using. "The State knows no religion," they say; it is wholly "a private concern" between the *individual* and his Maker. The "State knows no God." They wonder the zealous bigot cannot see how clear this makes everything. If he would only assent to propositions so easy, so self-evident, we should have peace. But set these confident logicians to define what they mean by terms so fluently employed, or ask them to show us how the State can keep clear of all action, direct or indirect, for or against, an interest so vital as religion, so all-pervading, so intimately affecting every other, and how soon they begin to stammer! What is secular? The one who attempts to define it would perhaps begin with a negative. It is that which has no connection with religion, no aspects, no relations, no tendencies, no suggestions, beyond this

world, or the narrowest view of it, this *age* or *seculum*. Now let him apply it to particular branches of education. There is the learning of the alphabet, spelling, reading. But what shall the child read? It would be very difficult to find a mere reading-book—unless its contents were an empty gabble, like the nonsense Latin verses of some schools—that would not somewhere, and in some way, betray moral or immoral, religious or irreligious ideas, according to the judgment of some minds. But let us waive this, and go on. Arithmetic is secular. Geography is secular; though we have seen things under the head of physical geography that some classes of religionists might object to as betraying a spirit hostile to the idea of the earth's creation in any form. But go on. Including the pure mathematics, as being pure mathematics and nothing else, we have about got to the end of our definition. No thinking man would pretend that the departments of life and motion, chemistry, dynamics, physiology, could be studied apart from a higher class of ideas. But secularity would interfere here in a very strange way. When these roads of knowledge thus tend upward toward the eternal light it would shut down the gate and eject the book. Natural philosophy, as taught by Newton and Kepler, gets beyond secularity. When, on the other hand, after the manner of Humboldt, Lamarck, and Darwin, its progress is in the direction of the eternal darkness, the study of it becomes entirely *unsectarian*; it violates no rights of conscience!

In other departments it is still more difficult to set the secular bound. History, the philosophy of history, political philosophy, psychology, ethics, however strong the effort to dereligionize them, do all, when left to their proper expansion, spurn any such bounds. Art, too, when wholly secularized—poetry stripped of its religious ideality—how long would they resist such a narrowing, suffocating process? A lower dogma was never maintained than this of a wholly secular education, or one more utterly *impracticable*. The subject must inevitably die under the operation, and religion must come back again into our schools and colleges, to save them from inanity and extinction.

There may be stated here some reasons why this plea of neutrality, though so false, is yet so specious and misleading. It arises from the fact that the statement of moral, religious, and theological ideas demands clear and positive language. The hostile forms, on the other hand, are disguised under vague and endlessly varying negations. They are Protean, too, in their appellations. They take to themselves the names of literature, art, philosophy, reform. This procedure shows itself in reading-books intended for our primary schools; in text-books prepared for the higher institutions; in essays and periodicals that strew the tables of reading-rooms attached to our colleges and academies; and, above all, in the public lecturing, male and female, which may be said to have become a part of our educational system. For example: Should the writer of this attempt to explain before such an audience "the Doctrines of Grace," as they are called, or that unearthly system of ideas which can be traced through the whole line of the Church—Patristic, Roman, and Protestant—in their production of a strong unearthly character, then would be immediately heard the cry of bigotry, or the senseless yell of Church and State. And now for the *opposing* "dogmas," as they really are, notwithstanding all their disguises. They make their entrance under endlessly varied forms. Pantheism has free admittance; but that is not dogmatic—it calls itself philosophy. In some lecture on progress, or history, the most essential of these old "Doctrines of Grace" may be sneeringly ignored or covertly assailed; but that is literature. Darwinism is expounded, with its virtual denial of anything like creation; or Huxleyism, which brings man out of the monkey, and the monkey out of the fungus—that is science. Or it may be the whining nonsense which glorifies the 19th century at the expense of the far honester 18th, and talks so undogmatically of the deep "yearning" for some-

thing better--that is, "the coming faith." And so goes on this exhibition of impartiality, with its exclusion of everything dogmatic and theological.

On these points the barest suggestions are enough for thinking men who are observant of the real signs of the times. We have proved the falsehood of this plea of neutrality. We have shown what a sham is this common cant of "secularity." There are but two conclusions to be drawn: Either the State cannot educate at all; or, in so doing, it must have regard to something predominant--so predominant, we may say, in the moral and religious state of the nation that it enters into the very character of our nationality as much as our language, our literature, our political philosophy, or anything else that is vital and ruling in the national mind. There is a national mind, and Christianity as yet is an important part of it.

From an unusually full and forcible discussion by Dr. R. W. Clark, of Albany, we select several strong and effective points:

Different Aspects of the Conscience Question.

As believers in the Bible, we are under the most solemn obligations to communicate its truths to the rising generation. I am bound, as a moral being, accountable to God for my influence, to do all in my power to make known its truths to every human being. I am even bound to send it to the most distant nations, that it may educate the ignorant, enlighten the superstitious, and fit man for the duties of this life and the rewards of the life to come. Much more am I bound to give it to the children in my own country, where every valuable institution depends for existence upon its circulation and influence. Between the Holy Scriptures, as the supreme authority, and my conscience, I can allow nothing to enter. To me, the Bible is the higher law in Church and State in all the relations of life. It is the basis of our State as well as the Church. Civil freedom has its roots in its laws, in the virtues it inculcates, and can draw its strength and power from no other source. But the Romanist tells me that he is as conscientiously opposed to the Bible as I am in favor of it. His conscience prompts him to exclude from the child's mind the light of God's word, and introduce in its stead the teachings and superstitions of Popery. I ask him upon what his conscience is founded. Has he exercised his own reason and judgment in matters of religion, or has he avowedly yielded them up to the law of obedience to his superior? Does he not regard the traditions of men, decisions of councils and the will of Popes as higher authority than the Word of God? If, then, such a conscience is to be admitted on an equality with one, or with millions, as in our land, enlightened by divine truth, then we must extend the principle still farther and recognize the authority of the Pagan conscience and every conscience upon whatever it may be founded. The premise granted, we cannot stop short of this conclusion.

But even allowing that these consciences are deserving of respect, what is to be done with the consciences of the Protestant Christians in our country? Look at the facts in the case. We have in the United States some sixty-five thousand common schools, containing seven millions of pupils, sustained at an annual expense of eight millions of dollars, nine-tenths of which at least is paid by Protestants. The President of the United States, in his late message, puts our population at forty millions. The highest number that I have ever heard the Roman Catholics claim in our country for themselves is seven millions. This leaves thirty-three millions of non-Catholics. Leaving out of view the atheists and infidels, we have twenty millions or more of Protestants whose consciences demand that the Bible should be kept in the schools. Now the point is, which class of consciences shall rule in this matter? If the Bible is put out, obviously the consciences of the twenty millions of Protestants are sacri-

ficed to the consciences of the Romanists. Besides, they are no longer even on an equality ; for by this act the consciences of the Romanists are respected *more than those of the Protestants*. Then it should be remembered that this clamor for the exclusion of the Bible does not come from the seven millions of Romanists in the land, but it comes from the priests. The mass of common people in the Roman Catholic communion, I believe, do not desire to have the Bible removed. There are tens of thousands of Roman Catholics in these United States, whose consciences have never been troubled by this Bible question. I believe that they have never thought that their temporal blessings, or that the final salvation of their souls, were periled by reading God's Word. I know that the priests are troubled. But I cannot, without more light, see either the reason or expediency, of sacrificing all the other consciences in the land, to the claims of theirs.

Common schools are the offspring of Protestantism. We can have them because we are not under the dominion of the Pope. He has proved conclusively that Romanism is the enemy of common schools, of popular education in every form. Americans will not, if they are wise, put an institution that they love so much into the hands of its enemies. The glory of our system is universal education : that of Rome is universal ignorance. The meridian of Romish ascendancy *was the midnight of the world's history!*

The Bible in State Reform Schools, &c.

Turning from this point, let us consider the bearing of the question under discussion, upon those schools that are established by the State for the children of paupers and criminals, and upon the institutions for the unfortunate classes in society. If the principle that the State has no right to provide religious instruction is admitted, then the Bible must be removed from every institution and school that is supported by the State. You must remove it from all the institutions for the deaf and dumb, and the blind, from alms houses, jails, and reform schools for juvenile offenders ; and from every institution that is supported by the State. Its banishment must be absolute and universal, if you are to have a State without religion. In the schools connected with alms houses, and other public institutions, there are thousands of children, who, but for those schools, would never have known anything of the Bible nor felt its moral influence. Their parents being vicious, or addicted to crime, have left them exposed to every degrading and corrupting influence. In visiting such schools, it appeared to me that their great charm was the religious influence that was thrown over the pupils. It was a thrilling spectacle to see these poor outcasts, thus provided by the State with the bread of life, and trained up for usefulness. As an aid to discipline in these schools, the teachers find the Bible absolutely indispensable.—Many of the children committed to their care, owing to past neglect and to the wicked habits already contracted, would be beyond their control were they not allowed to make use of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures.

Suppose that the Bible is excluded from the school for the blind, which is supported by the State. Here are gathered, say, one hundred blind children, who day by day read their lessons by tracing the raised letters with their fingers. They become acquainted with geography, philosophy, portions of history, but from the beginning to the end of the year, their fingers never light upon the word Bible. They never trace out the words "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved"—never read that sublime and stirring declaration, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." Would it not be the greatest cruelty to add to the darkness that surrounds this unfortunate class the deeper moral darkness produced by the exclusion of God's blessed word? Are the consciences of a class of our

citizens violated by allowing a stream of light from God's mercy seat to enter their souls, and cheer them in their dark pilgrimage through this world?

Take also the institutions for the deaf and dumb. These have been established in almost every State in our Union, at the public expense; and come under the same general laws that govern our common schools. Who with one spark of humanity in his soul, with the smallest amount of interest in the welfare of others, would advance the idea that this class of persons should be deprived of religious instruction?

You are all well aware of the efforts that have been made, for several years past, to make our prisons institutions of reform. The idea has been, not simply to punish the criminal, but to save him from the personal disastrous effects of his own vices and crimes; to make of him, if possible, a good citizen, and a Christian man. The agency used in this work of Reform, which has been attended with great success in many prisons throughout our land, has been the Bible.

There is no name that I can mention, before an Albany audience, more respected than that of General Amos Pilsbury, the efficient and successful Superintendent of the Albany Penitentiary. Meeting him casually on Monday last, I inquired of him if he had the Bible in his Penitentiary. He replied, "We have a copy in every cell, and the prisoners read it through several times. They often express to me their deep interest in its narratives and truths, and some have said they found something new in the Bible every time they read it. Several have committed whole chapters to memory, and," added the General, "*the men who do the most work in the shops of the prisons, are those who learn most of the Bible.*" In reply to other inquiries, he stated that he had at present four hundred convicts, and that he needed the influences of the Bible as much for the discipline as for the reformation of the criminals.

The details of General Pilsbury's success in the Albany Penitentiary, and the letters of gratitude and thanks that he has received from discharged convicts, for his kindness to them, for the religious influence that he exerted over them, and even for his firm discipline, would fill volumes. They present the most conclusive and beautiful commentary upon the power of the Bible in our prisons. Would it be wise for us to give up such prisons as these, and adopt as our models the prisons of Spain and Italy, into the cells of which the Bible never enters? If the Bible must come out of schools on the ground that the State has nothing to do with religion, the same principle must drive it out of our prisons, and out of every institution connected with the State. This is the inevitable logic of the premise that has been admitted. Are there any Protestant ministers or laymen prepared for this? Or do any Protestants lay the flattering unction to their souls, that when the Bible is removed from all these schools and public institutions, that this is forever to settle the question, and that henceforth in this great Republic, the very existence of which disturbs every papal throne in Europe, we shall lie down as lambs in our fold, with none to molest or make us afraid? Or do they suppose that by first giving up the Bible and thus taking the religious basis from under the schools, they will obtain a better position from which to contend with the foe? This is what some of them say in the pulpit, in the newspapers, and in private circles.

The Bible and the Chinese Population.

But we have still other classes to deal with, in this great question of education, and let us see how we stand related to them. In California there are several thousand of Chinese, many of whom own property and pay taxes. One of them, we will suppose, sends his children to a public school; and there in the reading lesson they are taught that Christ was superior to Confucius, and that men ought to worship God rather than idols. The children come home and do not manifest the usual reference for the idols that are in the house. The parents become offended and ex-

cited, and soon the whole Chinese population are making war against these schools. They declare, first, that the State has got nothing to do with religion; that it is a perversion of the public funds to give to the mind of a child a religious bias. They declare, secondly, that their rights as citizens are trampled upon, and that in this free country they are resolved no longer to submit to such encroachments upon their religion. Thirdly, they say that their consciences are violated, and they demand a division of the school fund, that their children may be educated according to their own views—that is, in the principles of idolatry. Now, what shall be done? Remember that as we deal with the thousands now in California, we must in justice deal with fifty millions of Chinese who might come and settle in all our States and cities.

First, shall we yield to them the doctrine that the State has nothing to do with religion? If we do, we shall be the first nation that ever existed on the globe, from the time of Adam to the present hour, that yielded to such a doctrine.

Secondly, we must acknowledge that the State is atheistical. For it must believe in a God, or not believe in a God. It cannot, in the nature of things, occupy a neutral position. The Chinese Government must believe in idolatry, or not believe in it. The Government of the Papal States must believe in the Pope, or not believe in him, and you cannot have a State without a religion of some kind. There never was one, and there never will be one on this earth. The Governments of Europe are divided into Protestant and Catholic. If the Government is not Protestant it is Catholic, and vice versa.

But we are told our Government tolerates all religions. True, it does. But toleration is one thing, and the yielding up of the national life to the demands of idolatry or Romanism is quite another thing. The Papal States stand or fall through their belief, or disbelief in the Pope. The Chinese Government stands or falls through its faith, or disbelief in idolatry. The roots of the American Government run into the Bible, and with the Bible our Government stands or falls. If the Chinese get the majority here, they will overthrow the Government and establish one in accordance with their religious ideas; ideas that do, and in the nature of things must, control the politics, education, and social habits and customs of a people. If the Romanists gain a majority, they will establish a Papal Government. And for one, I think we had better wait until they take it from us, rather than stand, trembling, and give it to them, while in population we are thirty-three millions to their six or seven millions.

The New Creed for the United States.

Listen to the boastings of the foes of our schools over what has already been accomplished in Cincinnati. The *Western Watchman*, of St. Louis, a Roman Catholic paper, says: "The much vexed question of Bible reading in the public schools of Cincinnati is at length settled. * * * The resolution of the board is sweeping; and not only is the Bible excluded, and all hymns, prayers, and whatever else savors of religion. Books, too, in which Christianity is taught, must be replaced, or expurgated, and no vestige of religious truth can be allowed to disgrace the hallowed precincts of the school room. Protestants are found for the first time in the history of our State school system, taught that no religion, not even that weak dilution of it, which we call Puritanism, is compatible with the well being of their much extolled institution. Our school instruction must be purely materialistic. If the name of the Author of Christianity is mentioned at all, He must be spoken of as one of the men who figured prominently in history, as we would speak of Mohammed, Julius Cæsar, or Napoleon. Under no circumstances may we hint to the child that the great preacher and teacher was God. We may not even tell him that he has a soul, or that there is any code of morality outside the statutes of the city, and the records

of the police courts. There must be nothing in the character or surroundings of our schools which might offend a Jew, a Mohammedan, a disciple of Confucius, or a common infidel. Our State has no religion, and our schools can have none."

This logical and practical issue of the proposed withdrawal of the Bible we commend to consenting Protestants, as coming from the very men on account of whose consciences it is proposed. Coming from such a source and in such a connection, surely the mere ideal conception of so fearful a result in the establishment of a godless State, must have a weighty argumentative force to every honest, thoughtful Christian mind!

To certain objections and references of "The Catholic View," the *American Educational Monthly* thus replies :

The charge is, that the public schools are infidel schools, and that the Government is unjust in taxing Catholics to promote infidelity ; and the consequence is, Catholics say, they cannot send to such schools.

This is certainly a hard accusation ; and it is one which Catholics must prove, before they can expect the public to acquiesce in it. Is not the Bible read? Yes ; but, says the writer of "The Catholic View," "To read the Bible without note or comment to *young children* is to abandon them to *dangerous speculation*, or to leave them dry and barren of *all* Christian knowledge." In the first place, is this so? Are "young children" really the ones to indulge in "dangerous speculations?" And is all scriptural truth so shrouded in symbols and mystery that a child cannot understand it? Does it require note or comment to be able to gather the meaning of the decalogue, the histories, the Saviour's teachings, the plain precepts of the Gospel? Either the writer has a very confused idea of the mental workings and abilities of "young children," or else he is sadly pushed for an argument to sustain his case.

"But we cannot consent," Catholics say, "that our children shall receive secular education without religious training." We do not ask them to do it. All we ask is that, like other denominations, they do their own religious training without looking to the State to help them do it ; that they cease to harp upon the injustice of the Government in not doing for them what it does not do for others, and what others have the good sense not to ask it to do for them.

The place for religious instruction as such, that is, for *catechetical and doctrinal teaching* and *Biblical exposition*, is not the school room at all. The clerk of the Board of Education, in his History of Public Education in the City of New York, has well said, "Each denomination is coming more and more distinctly to realize that the true protection of the young from adverse proselyting influences is to be found, not in withdrawing them from the common ground of the future citizens, the common school, but in fortifying their minds and hearts through the teaching of parents and the systematic weekly training of special religious instructors."

But not only is the school-room not the place for teaching religious doctrines ; the State, with us, has no mission, no right to contribute directly or indirectly of its funds for this end. Ours is a *civil* Government only, and has a right to tax the people for *civil* purposes only. It is not a union of Church and State. It is, therefore, not a country in which religious institutions may be supported by Government funds. Hence, all references to the practice of European nations in sustaining denominational schools are to no purpose. As arguments in favor of a distribution of our public school funds for carrying on denominational schools, they are value-

less. There is no parallel between the two cases. The State-systems of Europe, in supporting religious institutions, are but acting in accordance with the fundamental principles on which they are based. With us, however, for the State to assume to provide for the religious instruction of any portion of the people would be contrary to the fundamental principles of our governmental system ; it would be a usurpation of power striking at the very foundation of our civil and religious rights, and of our existence as a nation.

Dr. Seward, of Middletown, N.Y., puts some points so clearly that we insert them, though at the risk of some repetition :

It is urged that our Government, which knows no State religion, places all creeds upon the same footing ; that the reading of the Bible in our schools sanctions and commends a *Bible* creed, and it should be dispensed with, as *unjust* and *oppressive* towards certain classes of our citizens who reject the Bible, either as a whole or in part.

Admit, for a moment, the validity of this reason. Then, for the same reason, you must throw out, with the Bible, many of your *text books*, which quote the Bible, or which enforce Christian maxims. You must purge your readers and speakers of whatever they contain that commends the beauty and excellence of the Bible. You must purge your grammars of the parsing lessons that are taken from the poetry of Isaiah, or David, or indeed from any such author as Milton, who might be objectionable as a Christian author. You must purge your histories of all facts and dates that are given on Bible authority. You must purge your astronomies of some of the very names of the heavenly bodies, because they coincide with, if they are not taken from, the Scriptures. If it be unjust to have the Bible itself in the schools, then it is equally unjust to have there anything which sanctions the Bible, or which leads to it by exciting either interest or curiosity. And as many of your text books very manifestly do this, you must throw those out also.

And again. When you have excluded the Bible, what are you to do about the discipline of your schools? and about the morality of your schools? If our children may not be taught religion there, they must be taught some morality at least, or our school system is worst than rotten to the core. But *what system* of morality shall be inculcated and carried out by the enforcement of discipline? It must not be a Bible morality, because that is oppressive to some who do not accept the Bible ; and it must not be a Christian morality, because that is equally oppressive to others who do not believe in Christianity.

And again. If the presence of the Bible be oppressive in the schools, why is it not equally oppressive elsewhere? And how soon before we shall be asked to remove it *wherever* it is oppressive? from our courts of law ; from our halls of legislation ; from the regulation of our daily business.

We have already Bible truth and Christian morality incorporated into our laws and our customs ; and we object to removing them. The reason which is urged for dispensing with them here, is equally valid for dispensing with them everywhere ; and we cannot consent to what *points* to a CLEAN SWEEP of the Christian Scriptures, and the Christian Sabbath, and Christian oaths, and Christian customs from the land. If to retain them wounds the conscience of some, yet to remove them wounds our conscience no less.

But this is not our whole answer. We reply further, that the distinct recognition of Christian sentiment and Christian morals, which is actually the matter complained of as oppressive, is not to-day inaugurated, but has come down from the past. It is proof, therefore, of what was the original design of our Government, and what was the intention of its founders. You may dispense with prayer in your

schools ; but there was prayer in your first Congress. Presently you may have no Sabbath ; but there was a Sabbath at the beginning of our national existence. And every distinct recognition of the Bible, and of the Christ of the Bible—whether upon the statute book, or in the regulation of judicial proceedings, or in the legalizing of holidays, or wherever it is found—is proof of what the Fathers intended ; that they meant this to be a land of freedom, but not of licentiousness—the abode of Bible liberty, and not of Infidel, nor Pagan. The issue which now is raised (because the Bible in the schools furnishes a convenient point at which to make it) is of the nature of an *innovation* ; it proposes a *departure* from earliest religious sentiment and usage. We are suspicious of all such innovations ; we cannot counsel any such departures. And if we wish to hold fast, if we cannot consent to relinquish, what has been handed down to us, we are simply faithful to our own institutions, and faithful to the memory of those who planted them. We thus are steadfast to our original principles ; and in such steadfastness do we find the brightest promise, and the chief security, for the future of the nation.

The generous Frenchman and brilliant Roman Catholic Preacher, to whose eloquence his own countrymen have paid abundant homage, said justly the other evening, at the Academy of Music, “The foundation of your people is the Bible, the book that speaks of God, the living word of Jesus Christ. * * * A belief in Jesus is at the root of this nation. * * * I have found here liberty associated with Christianity, and have been among a people who do not think to be free they must be parted from God !” Let us give no future traveler opportunity to reverse this judgment.

Some say, “Let us dispense with the Bible, and so save our schools.” But you will not save them thus, so far as *Romish* exactions can defeat you. Romanists tell you plainly (not to say defiantly) that they will have none of your schools ; that they are determined on “denominational” schools ; and when they are made “denominational,” they must be made Roman Catholic, or they will still be unsatisfactory, and therefore will still be opposed.

In view of the fair warning which Rome gives us, there is but one way to save the schools, and that is to save them as they are. When you have begun to change them at her bidding, you must go on changing them at her bidding, for this present contemplated change, as she declares, does not suit her at all. And if you mean to resist her exactions anywhere, it is easier to do it at the outset than after you shall have strengthened her exactions by concessions—concessions, too, which she plainly declares will never satisfy her.

We cite next some paragraphs from an argument of R. H. Dana, in 1854, upon an issue raised by a Roman Catholic father with a School Committee in Ellsworth, Maine, concerning the reading of the common English Bible in the school.

BUT our opponents may say that they do not object to the Bible, but to the translation. We cannot read the original in the schools. This is the common English Bible, which has always been used. It is not a “*Protestant Bible*.” Great portions of the translation were made by men in the bosom of the General Church, before the Reformation, by Wickliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, and Matthew. Testimony as to its accuracy has been borne by learned men of the Roman Church. As a well of pure English undefiled, as a fountain of pure idiomatic English, it has not its equal in the world. It was fortunately—may we not, without presumption, say providentially?—translated at a time when the English language was in its purest state. It has done more to *anchor* the English language in the state it then was, than all

other books together. The fact that so many millions of each succeeding generation, in all parts of the world where the English language is used, read the same great lessons in the same words, not only keeps the language anchored where it was in its best state, but it preserves its universality, and frees it from all material provincialisms and *patois*, so that the same words, phrases and idioms are used in London, New York, San Francisco, Australia, China and India. To preserve this unity and steadfastness, the Book of Common Prayer has done much, Shakespeare, Milton, and Bunyan have done much, but the English Bible has done ten-fold more than they all.

From the common English Bible, too, we derive our household words, our phrases and illustrations, the familiar speech of the people. Our associations are with its narratives, its parables, its histories and its biographies. If a man knew the Bible in its original Greek and Hebrew by heart, and did not know the common English version, he would be ignorant of the speech of the people. In sermons, in public speeches, from the pulpit, the bar and the platform, would come allusions, references, quotations—that exquisite electrifying by conductors, by which the heart of a whole people is touched by a word, a phrase, in itself nothing, but everything in its power of conducting—and all this would be to him an unknown world. No greater wrong, intellectually, could be inflicted on the children of a school, yea, even on Roman Catholic children, than to bring them up in ignorance of the English Bible. As well might a master instruct his pupil in Latin, and send him to spend his days among scholars, and keep him in ignorance of the words of Virgil and Horace, and Cicero and Terence and Tacitus. As a preparation for life, an acquaintance with the common English Bible is indispensable.

If the Bible is not read, where so well can the principles of morality and all the virtues be taught? “How infinitely superior,” says Maurice, “is a gospel of facts to a gospel of notions!” How infinitely superior to abstract ethics are the teachings of the narratives and parables of the Bible! What has ever taken such hold on the human heart, and so influenced human action? The story of Jacob and Esau, the unequalled narrative of Joseph and his brethren, Abraham and Isaac, the pathetic and romantic story of Saul, the death of Absalom, Naaman the Syrian, the old prophet, the wild, dramatic, poetical histories of Elijah and Elisha, the captivities of the Jews, the episode of Ruth, unsurpassed for simple beauty and pathos, and time would fail me to tell of Daniel, Isaiah, Samuel, Eli, and the glorious company of the apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, and the noble army of martyrs. Where can a lesson of fraternity and equality be struck so deeply into the heart of a child as by the parable of Lazarus and Dives? How can the true nature and distinctions of charity be better expounded than by the parables of the widow who cast her mite into the treasury, and the woman with the alabaster box of precious ointment? Can the prodigal son, the unjust steward, the lost sheep ever be forgotten? Has not the narrative of the humble birth, the painful life, the ignominious death of our Lord, wrought an effect on the world greater than any and all lives ever wrought before? even on those who doubt the miracles, and do not believe in the mystery of the Holy Incarnation, and the Glorious Resurrection and Ascension!

We adduce, in conclusion, brief extracts, having a general or special bearing upon the subject.

THE State, say some, has no right to act as a sectarian teacher; and for it to command, or even to tolerate, the reading of the Bible in the public schools, is to make it a sectarian teacher, by making it, through the Bible, disseminate doctrines which they reject. And it is sincerely thought by some good men that there is no fair way of doing justice to these demands, but that of removing from our common school

system "whatever may conflict with the religious belief of any portion of the community, trusting to family instruction, Sunday schools, church influences and similar means, to cultivate the religious nature, etc."

The concession amounts to the position that the State has no right to exert in its schools any moral influence whatever, that shall be above the standard of the lowest of its citizens—a monstrous dogma, whose statement is its own sufficient refutation. Nor is this the worst of it. Inasmuch as it is the essential tenet of the infidel that the Bible is not the word of God, and is not to be appealed to as such, in that moment when he can get the State to cease treating it as such, he practically subsidizes the State as the propagandist of his infidelity. So that when the question is reduced to its fundamental elements, there is no avoidance of the conclusion that Romanists, Jews, and skeptics demand the exclusion of the Bible from the public schools as a *sectarian measure in their interests*; that is, they ask the State to desert its old policy of impartiality among all sects recognizing the Bible, and do a thing which shall directly inure to their benefit, and make the State, to a degree, a co-teacher with them of their peculiar notions about religion.

So long as a sound morality lies at the foundation of all competent civil government, it is both the right and the duty of the State to teach good morals to the children in its schools. And not only can there be no good morality taught there without the Bible as its manual, but there can be none taught to which every "conscientious" objection brought against the Bible in the schools, will not as much apply.—*Congregationalist*.

THE question has now entered upon a new stage. The Roman Catholics have found out that, when the Bible is left out, the schools will be entirely irreligious and "Godless." That is not what they want. They do not desire a free chance, and a negative toleration—they want a positive opportunity. They want Roman Catholic instruction, at least for their own children. It is therefore idle to discuss any further the advisability of a concession which would not be satisfactory. The majority of the American people are not ready to see the schools become utterly neglectful of religion, and if it is unjust for the majority to dictate to the minority, it is no less so for the minority to coerce the majority. The ideal of the Roman Catholic system is, that education shall be in the hands of the Priesthood, and that they shall exercise discretion as to the subjects to be studied, the amount of knowledge the pupil may acquire, and the method of study which he shall pursue. It is a system calculated to produce *dependent* men and women, who never go beyond the limits marked out for them, and never walk without the leading string. The common school regards knowledge as a boundless field, in which each one may, and ought to, walk as far as his strength will carry him. Its method aims to train the individual to independence and self-reliance. It is the scientific method as opposed to the scholastic. It aims to train the powers, so that they may be applied to any new demand which may be made upon them, while the other method leaves the man all astray—uncertain, the moment he passes out of the circumstances in which he was trained, and the conditions for which he was prepared. There can never be any question, as long as the two systems exist side by side, which best fits men for worldly success, above all here in this new country; and it is inevitable that parents will choose the system which they see is best calculated to give their children worldly success. Here we find, unquestionably, the ground of the Roman Catholic hostility.—*The Living Church*.

THE State has, in America, very wisely solved the problem of public education, by refusing to recognize the differences of theologic opinion as they prevail among the churches. It has placed the Bible upon the teacher's desk, to be daily read. It has sanctioned the use of the universal prayer taught by Christ. The fatherhood of God,

the mission of Jesus to the world, the responsibility of every human creature to the All-seeing One, the duty of love to our neighbor, the necessity of purity of thought, as well as outward propriety of conduct, are lessons which cannot fail to be conveyed by a daily reading of the inspired volume. And we submit that these will be more effective as lessons for youth than the doctrine of the sacraments, predestination and free-will, or the Divine authority of the successors of St. Peter, or the invocation of saints, or purgatory. "To read the Bible," says the Roman Catholic, "without note or comment, to young children, is to abandon them to dangerous speculation, or to leave them dry and barren of all Christian knowledge." We hold that to read the Bible thus is to convey to the young child the idea of Christ, to impress upon his mind that image of purity and all-loving tenderness which is in itself an invaluable possession.—*Methodist (N. Y.)*

In determining the character and influence of these schools for ourselves when called upon to decide whether we should prefer to divide the school money among the sects, or apply it, as now, to the sustenance of unsectarian schools, we may confidently affirm that those public institutions are not only not "godless," but are positively moral and religious in their influence. There is a daily recognition of the Divine Presence and Providence in the reverent reading of His inspired word, in the utterance of the Lord's Prayer, and in the songs and hymns that form so important a portion of the training especially of the younger children.

But our school books, certainly the great proportion of them, have been prepared by devout, religious men; and while the peculiar views of no sect are spoken of either with approbation or disapprobation, the great fundamental truths of the Christian religion are, with more or less directness, presented in them, and the virtues of a truly Christian temper receive constant illustration. The copies that are written and re-written for practice in penmanship until indelibly imprinted upon the memory—the incidents in the history of the nations, pervaded as they are with evidences of a Divine Providence—and the selections for constant reading in the admirable compendiums now in use, are replete with the most impressive moral and religious lessons. In all the States where the public school system is established, high moral qualifications are demanded of the instructors, and, both by precept and example, moral and religious truths are required to be inculcated.—*Christian Advocate.*

START with the principle that nothing must be taught in our public schools that trenches upon the convictions of any in regard to religion; concede that there is nothing of the nature of general religion that the State may sanction, or is bound to sanction; give it up that the Bible is a sectarian book, and all public education is plainly at an end. An expurgation of books and instructions that would meet this demand would leave little to be taught that was valuable. The impracticability of the principle that no one's prejudices must be offended, has led us, therefore, to pronounce its advocates the advocates of the destruction of our entire common school system. On but one principle can we sustain common school education, so essential to our national perpetuity, and that is by starting with the principle that we are a Christian country, and that heathenism, infidelity, and all kindred systems must submit to the preference of Christianity. Mr. Webster well says: "Objection to the multitude and differences of sects is but the old story, the old infidel argument. It is notorious there are certain great religious truths which are admitted and believed by all Christians; * * * and cannot all these great truths be taught to children without their minds being perplexed with crushing doctrines and sectarian controversies?"

Shrewd and blasphemous Thomas Paine said in his *Age of Reason*: "Let us

devise means to establish schools of instruction, that we may banish the ignorance that the ancient *regime* of kings and priests has spread among the people. Let us propagate morality, unfettered by superstition."

Superstition was his name for religion, and he simply wanted to oust religion from the schools, and thus make an infidel world. This is the present purpose of Rationalism ; while Catholicism hopes simply to get public money to teach her sectarianism. With these diverse purposes the two are leagued to the same result: Paine and the Pope, Rationalism and Rome.—*N. W. Ch. Advocate*.

The only reason that has yet been given why the Bible should not be read in the schools is that it is not fit to be read. The Romanist gives one set of reasons why it is not fit to be read, and the infidels give another set of reasons, but this is the result of all the arguments. But neither party has given an instance of any person, old or young, in school or out of school, ever being injured by reading the Bible. If it corrupts the young, why not give some example ?—*Western Ch. Advocate*.

Since the foregoing was in form, we have received a third discourse of Dr. R. W. Clark, from which we take the following additional views and points, well worthy of consideration :—

Professor Stowe, in his Report on Elementary Instruction in Europe, says :—"In regard to the necessity of moral instruction and the beneficial influence of the Bible in schools, the testimony was no less explicit and uniform. I inquired of all classes of teachers, and men of every grade of religious faith, instructors in common schools, high schools, and schools of art, of professors in colleges, universities, and professional seminaries in cities and in the country, in places where there was a uniformity and in places where there was a diversity of creeds, and I never found but one reply, and that was, to leave the moral faculty uninstructed was to leave the most important part of the human mind undeveloped, and to strip education of almost everything that can make education valuable ; and that the Bible, independently of the interest attending it, as containing the most ancient and influential writings ever recorded by human hands, and composing the religious system of almost the whole of the civilized world, is, in itself, the best book that can be put into the hands of children to interest, to exercise, and to unfold their intellectual and moral powers. Every teacher whom I consulted repelled with indignation that moral instruction is not proper for schools ; and spurned with contempt the allegation that the Bible cannot be introduced into common schools without encouraging a sectarian bias in the matter of teaching ; an indignation and contempt which I believe will be fully participated in by every high-minded teacher in Christendom."

If the Bible is taken from these schools, and all religious and moral instruction suppressed, and the millions of voices that have been accustomed to sing religious songs are suppressed, we relinquish the greatest power that Almighty God has placed in our hands to mould aright the elements that endanger the Republic. Instead of thereby saving civil liberty, we take the first step towards its destruction. Instead of preserving religious toleration, we pave the way for intoleration. Instead of strengthening the State, we demolish one of its main pillars, and encourage the foes of liberty and the Bible to go on until every pillar and column is shattered, and the whole fabric, which has been so long our boast and glory, is level with the ground.

Or to divide the school fund would be just as fatal. For this would be virtually saying to the Roman Catholics, you can retain your allegiance to a foreign power, and yet be good American citizens. You can educate your children in a system that is in antagonism to Republicanism, and derive the funds for this from a Republican Government. The taxes that you pay to support the American Government that

gives to you protection and toleration, you may receive back again, to use for the purpose of undermining that Government. For why do you ask for a division of the funds, except that they may teach principles contrary to those now taught in our schools? If our schools are in harmony with the Government, theirs will not be. For they already acknowledge that their consciences are not in harmony with the principles of our Government. And how can they be when they owe allegiance to the Government of Rome? They cannot serve two masters, and I apprehend they do not strive very hard to do it.

Then, if we divide the funds with the Roman Catholics, we must, in order to be consistent, divide, on a basis of taxation or population, with all who differ from our fathers and from us. We must ascertain precisely what taxes the Jews pay, and what the infidels, and atheists, and the Chinese in California pay, and divide with each, that each class may have their separate schools. Then to preserve our glorious independence, and our religious toleration, we must have schools where the children are taught by the State that Jesus Christ has not yet come into the world. We must have others based upon infidelity and atheism, and others in which idols are set up for worship. After all this is done, can we pray to God to prosper the Republic; to preserve our blessed institutions, and to make us faithful to posterity, as our fathers were faithful to us?

The whole influence of the measure is to train up infidels and atheists. Nor will it be long before the discovery is made that those who have yielded up the Bible to Romanism have virtually yielded it up to Atheism. See the adroitness of the foe; see how he *gains more* than he bargained for. He has shut off the light of God's Word from the two million Catholic children in the schools, and at the same instant shut off the same precious light from the five million Protestant children. Yielding to his conscience, his rights, his system, we have sacrificed our own.

With what joy would the great Council, now in session at Rome, receive these glad tidings! And in the secret interviews of the Cardinals and Bishops, what opinions would they be likely to express of the intelligence, sagacity or manhood of the millions of Protestants in America who have been caught in such a trap? They might say that "it cost us armies, and blood and treasure to save France from the Huguenots. Three centuries of persecution and war has not wrested the Bible from a little band of Waldenses. The Hollanders conquered us when we were mighty, and have kept the Bible in their schools. But America, in the hour of her strength and glory, we have taken by a *fallacy*. We told them that they had a State without a religion, and they believed it! Nay, more. Protestant ministers came forward to help prove it! We also told them that, as a logical sequence, they must have a school system without a religion, and they believed that too." These gentlemen might quietly add: "We have struck the American Republic the heaviest blow that it has ever received. Slavery fought their national liberty, and they conquered. We assail their religion, and they yield without a struggle. We have burnt Bibles by the hundreds in the past, America delivers them up to us by tens of thousands. Our emissaries stand at the doors of sixty-five thousand schools and receive them from two hundred thousand teachers." They then go to the reform schools, almshouses, institutions for the blind, the deaf and dumb, that are supported out of the public treasury, and take the Bibles from all these. They then go to the jails and prisons, scattered over the land, and remove the Bibles from the chaplain's desks and from every cell, and destroy, at a single blow, the great reformatory system among prisoners that American philanthropists and prisoners' friends have toiled for fifty years to build up. They may then write over every prison door and upon every reform school, and every institution for the blind and deaf and dumb, and every public school in every village, town and city from Maine to Georgia, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific:—"A STATE WITHOUT RELIGION."

Henceforth, Romanism, infidelity and atheism walk together. They unite in hostility to the Bible, and consequently in hostility to institutions founded upon the Bible. Can we withstand these combined forces acting against the religion and the principles of honesty, integrity and virtue, which constitute the only possible basis of free institutions?

God founded our nation as truly as he founded the Kingdom of Israel; and the language that he addressed to His ancient people through His servant Moses he addresses to us: "Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments. * * * Keep therefore and do them: for this is your wisdom, and your understanding in the sight of the nations which shall bear all these statutes, and say surely this great nation is a wise and independent people. * * Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but teach them to thy sons and thy sons' sons. * * These words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart, and thou shall teach them diligently to thy children."—Deut. chapter 4 and 6. Can any one prove that these commands have a local application, or have been abrogated?

The Bible is the book for all nations—for the world. Its principles constitute the basis of every free, just and prosperous government. Its light illumines the conscience. It creates and sustains the doctrine of human rights. It is as intimately connected with the growth and destiny of nations as with the development of individual character and happiness. And shall there be a spot in this land from which it is excluded by law? While we rejoice that the gates of other nations are being opened to receive the Bible, shall we by authority of the Government of the United States close the doors of sixty-five thousand schools against it? How will this appear in the eye of Heaven?

Mr. F. H. Newhall, in *Zion's Herald*, discourses with a healthy irony upon the (so-styled) American idea of absolute religious liberty, especially seeking to *enlighten* those who hold it, as to its wide meaning and logical reach. Here are a few detached sentences, together with his terse conclusion:

MANY who are willing to prohibit government from deciding between Papist and Protestant, yet insist that it shall decide between Christian and Deist, still more would they insist that it shall decide between Christian and Pagan or Atheist. But how inconsistent is this! The disciple of Comte no more believes in a personal God than a Papist believes in justification by faith. What shall we say of the monstrous inconsistency of teaching in our commonest school-books as historic facts, stories for which there is absolutely no authority but the Bible? Stories which, however sacred they may be to the Christian, some of the most learned critics of our time have decided to be no more worthy of belief than the myths of Hesiod? Suppose that the children of the learned Ewald should emigrate to America, what right has government through its common schools to teach them that Moses was an inspired law-giver? What right would government have to intrude its faith upon the little Strausses, if there are any, by teaching them that Jesus Christ was a real historic personage?

But do not the very reading books universally used in our schools inculcate these religious dogmas on almost every page? Are they not penetrated through and through with the assumption of a personal God? The plain fact is, that all our text-books would have to be re-written from end to end. The Bible pervades all of them throughout, and as to the dogmas of Theism, they are interwoven into the warp and woof of all the science and literature that is taught and used in our schools to-day.

In order to provide books perfectly free from religious dogmas, no more feasible plan occurs to us than to translate and enlarge the French Eucyclopædia. It would be a work of immense labor, but no toil or sacrifice is too great in the cause of religious liberty. Denial of moral distinctions is an axiom in systems of speculation that number many and distinguished adherents to-day. What right then has government to inculcate by law that such denial is heresy? Yet it is doing that very thing to-day in every common school in America. Does not this show how the American people have yet to learn the very alphabet of toleration? All this shows the reflecting mind what an immense work is yet to be done to make our government and our educational institutions really free. Perhaps, before the work is ended, it may be discovered that there is, after all, such a thing as TRUTH, and that it is discoverable, not only in physics but in metaphysics, not only in chemistry but in ethics; that the eye of the soul sees as keenly and as clearly as the eye of the body, yea more, that religion has as solid a foundation as astronomy.

Result of the experiment in infidel France, of a godless system of education:—

In illustration of the necessity of infusing some religious or moral instruction into every general system of education, we need only refer to the example of France previous to her revolution, and you see her infidel philosophers preparing a system of education without religion, "the design of which was," says Burke, "to abolish the Christian religion under all its forms, whenever the minds of men were prepared for it. These enthusiasts," says he, "do not scruple to avow their opinion that a State can subsist without any religion, better than with one; and that they were able to supply the place of any good which might be in it by a project of their own, and this system they called a civic education."

Well, the experiment was made. The Bible and every book inculcating its principles were banished from all their institutions for public instruction; and what was the result? "Religion and its ministers were brought into contempt;" the temples erected for the worship of Almighty God were closed (or only opened for the entrance of "the Goddess of Reason,") the passions of men were let loose, the social ties dissolved, the domestic affections stifled, the foundations of civil society broken up, and a scene of horror ensued which no man can look back to, even at this distance of time, without shuddering at the depravity to which human nature, uninfluenced by religion, may reach even in an enlightened age and country. So complete was the desolation, that when the storm had subsided, and a committee was sent to Paris by one of the religious Societies of London, to ascertain the moral condition of the people, they searched four days in all the bookstores and print shops of Paris, before they could find a single copy of the Bible.

This civic education was the result of the French philosophy, the character and tendency of which is well described by one of its votaries. "I have consulted," says Rousseau, "our philosophers; I have perused their books, I have examined their several opinions; I have found them all proud, positive and dogmatizing, even in their pretended scepticism; knowing everything, proving nothing, and ridiculing one another; and this last is the only point in which they concur, and in which they are right. Where is the philosopher who for his own glory would not willingly deceive the whole human race? Where is he who in the secret of his heart proposes any other object than his own distinction? The great thing for him is to think differently from other people; under the pretence of being themselves the only people enlightened, they imperiously subject us to their magisterial decisions, and would fain palm upon us, for the true causes of things, the unintelligible systems they have erected in their own heads. While they overturn, destroy and trample under foot all that mankind reveres; snatch from the rich and great the only curb that can restrain their passions, tear from the heart all remorse of vice, all hopes of virtue, they still boast themselves the benefactors of mankind."

Such is the history of the experiment made in France of what was called a civic education, uncontrolled and uninfluenced by any religious sentiment or principle, and it would be strange indeed, if at this enlightened era there should be many advocates for introducing it here.

A word in closing. The foregoing citations, selected and condensed with much care from a large amount of matter, include all the points thus far brought out in the discussion. It is a gratifying fact that the question is everywhere awaking the deepest interest. Its various phases are set forth by well-digested articles in the Protestant press, by discourses, addresses, and discussions all over the land. Let the discussion go on, and upon points in which Christian men are disagreed let the fullest and fairest investigation be made and allowed on either side. And especially, we trust that the entire ministry, of every name, will first thoroughly study and then discriminately exhibit the principles and facts of this vital issue, in the pulpit, and if it can be wisely and usefully done, on the platform and through the secular press.

The "Tax-Levy" School Law.

Section 10 of the Law passed May 12, 1869.

Sec. 10. Hereafter,¹ an annual amount, equal to twenty per cent. on the excise moneys, received for said city in 1868,² to be distributed under the direction of an officer to be appointed for that purpose by the Board of Education of said city (whose compensation shall be paid from such amount), for the support of schools educating children gratuitously in said city, who are not provided for in the common schools thereof,³ excepting therefrom schools receiving contributions for their support from the City Treasury.

(The amount allowed to each child is a little over ten dollars.)

1. "Hereafter," *i. e.* year by year—its operation is thus permanent.
2. The *same amount* is fixed, 20 per cent., on *excise moneys* for 1868.
3. "Who are not provided for in the common schools." Now, hear what a Special Committee, appointed by the Board of Education, Sept. 15, 1869, say in their Report of Oct. 6, 1869 :

"The Committee caused to be made a thorough examination into the seating capacity of the School Buildings in the city of New-York. The average attendance for the year ending December 31, 1868, was 86,154, while the number of seats is 125,987, showing an excess of seats over the average attendance of 39,833. This clearly shows that no additional School Buildings will be required during the year 1870, and for some years to come."

How about the above limitation in the Tax Levy Law? According to the facts reported by this Special Committee, are not the 20,000 children "provided for in the common schools of said city" by the "39,833 unoccupied" seats?

We add, that the apportionment under the above Law amounted to \$220,000, which was duly distributed to Catholic and Protestant schools in nearly the proportion of four to one.